

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH.**

CR No. 2041 of 2015

Date of decision: 12.04.2016

Sukhbir Singh

..... Petitioner

Versus

Joginder Kumar and others

.....Respondents

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE DARSHAN SINGH

Present: Mr.Sudhir Aggarwal, Advocate
for the petitioner.

DARSHAN SINGH, J. (Oral)

The present revision petition has been preferred against the order dated 10.03.2015 passed by the learned Civil Judge (Jr. Division), Gurgaon, whereby the application filed by the petitioner for permission to lead additional evidence has been dismissed.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner contended that the petitioner wants to examine the hand writing expert in order to prove the signatures of the defendant no.1 on the sale deed Ex.P-5 as he has denied his signatures in his testimony. Certain revenue documents are also required to be produced.

3. I have duly considered the aforesaid contentions.

4. It has been fairly stated at bar by learned counsel for the petitioner that the petitioner has already examined the

attesting witness of the sale deed in order to prove its due

execution. The learned trial Court can also take into consideration the conduct of the respondent-defendant as he has even denied his signatures on the Vakalatnama and the written statement. These facts can be taken into consideration by the learned trial Court while appreciating the testimony of the defendant when he stepped into the witness box as DW-1.

5. The application moved by the petitioner with respect to production of the revenue documents is quite vague and indefinite as in the application, the petitioner has simply mentioned that he wants to produce the revenue documents pertaining to the land in question consisting mutations, jamabandies and other relevant documents. But, he has not specifically mentioned as to which mutations, jamabandies and other documents, the petitioner wants to produce. This type of vague request for additional evidence cannot be entertained.

6. Consequently, I do not find any illegality in the impugned order passed by the learned trial Court.

7. Thus, the present revision petition having no merits, is hereby dismissed.

12.04.2016

S.khan

**(DARSHAN SINGH)
JUDGE**